

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 through 20 are pending. Claims 7 through 12, 17 and 18 are allowed. By this response, claims 1 and 19 are amended and claim 2 is canceled. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendment and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indication of claim 2 as having recited allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 through 6, 13 through 16, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C§102(e) as being anticipated by Someya et al. (U.S. 6,756,955). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 19 each have been amended to include the features of a flicker interference detector and the compensation amount output device using the flicker detection data along with the compensation amount. The Examiner has stated the features of claim 2 (flicker detection), are allowable. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 19 to include the above noted features associated with claim 2 but have not amended the claims to include the exact language of claim 2. Nonetheless, Applicants assert that claims 1 and 19 should be allowable in view of the prior art and particularly Someya et al.

Although Applicants conclude that the claims are in condition for allowance, Applicants provide the following comments with regards to the differences between the claimed features and Someya reference. Someya et al., teaches a liquid crystal-driving circuit in which compensation data is obtained for compensating and adjusting the gray scale value of the image display. Regarding Fig. 2, relied upon in the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the Dc1 data from the look up table and the j3 data from the comparison unit each represent first and second compensation data, while the Dc2 data represents the third compensation amount. Applicants' respectfully submit that although Someya teaches particular compensation data,

Someya fails to teach the flicker detection and the use of flicker detection data with the compensation data as presently claimed.

Therefore, Applicants' respectfully submit that Someya et al., fails to teach each and every feature in claims 1 and 19, as required. Further, dependent claims 3 through 6, 13 through 16 and 20 are also distinguishable over the Someya reference in view of the above comments as well as the additional features that they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons above, Applicants' respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3 through 20 are disiguisable over the cited reference. Favorable considerations, and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Dated: May 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Chad J. Billings
Chad J. Billings
Registration No.: 48,917
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant